

**June 25, 2003**

**MCA-MDT Technical Committee Meeting**

The meeting began at 8:00 a.m.

Bob Kober opened the meeting to new MDT business. After the new business from MDT, both sides went through the remaining old business. MCA was then given the opportunity to offer their new business followed by a general discussion dealing with new supplemental specifications currently out for comment.

**MDT NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Median Barrier Rail Connections.** MDT informed MCA they would be changing the Median Barrier Rail Connections to other crash test approved connections that will meet up with the existing Barrier Rail. MDT is looking at getting this implemented by September. Detailed Drawings should be out soon for these connections.
2. **Value Engineering Proposals.** MDT talked about the Proposal process by stating that they receive proposals and then they form a committee to review the proposal. In order to have the proposals processed, MDT has to have the following criteria addressed: service life, economy of operation, ease of maintenance, desired appearance and safety. Having these issues addressed in the value engineering proposal speeds up the evaluation process.
3. **Claims Specification.** MDT informed MCA this specification should be out shortly. MDT stated that there are firm timelines on everyone's actions. This should encourage negotiations. MCA felt the strict timelines imposed on them were unfair because MDT does not have the same strict timelines. MCA also feels the timelines should be evened out for MCA and MDT.
4. **Electronic Bidding.** MDT would like to move forward with the electronic bidding but would like feedback from MCA. MDT informed MCA that there is a survey online to help gather this feedback. If feedback is positive, and after a couple of months of testing, MDT feels it will take 4 or 5 months to implement. MDT stated that online bidding would not be mandatory right now. MCA appreciated the opportunity to offer some feedback and will provide this feedback in time. MCA also stated that they might require some background explanation to help provide better comments.

**OLD BUSINESS**

1. **Erosion Control.** MCA wondered if the erosion control plans could be distributed with the bid packages because they feel they are bidding blind without them. MDT will look into this request.
2. **Heavy Duty Cattle Guard Bases.** MDT stated that since the detailed drawing for this is not ready, a special provision allowing the option for precast bases will be written for inclusion in projects with mainline cattleguards.
3. **Construction Memos.** MDT informed MCA that the memos would be out externally for MCA's use by the end of the week following the meeting. This item will most likely be dropped from future minutes unless problems come up.

**MCA NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Grade 5A and 6A Gravel.** MCA informed MDT that no one is currently able to reach the desired targets to receive incentive on the gravel. MCA mentioned that the problem seems to be between the 40 and 200 mesh. MCA would like to see the 40 mesh brought to the broadband to match the targets. MDT will look into this and offer a response by next meeting.
2. **Select Backfill.** MCA stated there is some variance in the specifications dealing with select backfill specifically to the bridge ends. MCA informed MDT there are different specifications for backfill for different jobs. MDT will consider this concern and will do something about the

inconsistency in specifications.

### **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

MDT stated to MCA that lately there have been some problems around the state dealing with the cleanup on job sites. There was a general discussion between both sides about the environmental violations that have been happening on jobs lately.

MCA informed MDT that they have received the language being distributed for comment dealing with bridge diaphragms and felt that some extra explanation was needed before comments could be made. MDT explained how they want the diaphragms to be consistent throughout the spec book and this will help to get this accomplished. MCA will comment on this specification before the comment due date.

MCA felt they needed more of an explanation from MDT regarding the newly distributed language dealing with contract time before comments could be made. MDT explained that the intent of these two specifications was to make the contractor aware of the costs the MDT and MCA will have to incur if the contractor chooses to work in the winter season. MCA replied back that any opportunity they have to get stuff done during a shutdown would help get the job done quicker. MCA will comment on these specifications by the comment due date.

MCA inquired about the changes made to the emulsified asphalt rapid setting temperature table under subsection 402.03.6. MDT explained that this is an errata change because the rapid setting temperatures were left out of the table. MCA will comment on this spec by the comment due date.

MCA asked if posting proposed supplemental specifications on the Q&A page would be a viable option. MDT agreed that this is a good idea and will keep that in mind as the Contractor's webpage is rebuilt.

The next meeting will be **July 23, 2003**, beginning at 8:00 a.m. at the **MCA Office**.

cc:	Darrin Grenfell, FHWA	Bob Kober
	Joel Marshik	Suzy Althof
	James Walther	Carl Peil
	Mark Wissinger	Scott Barnes
	Matt Strizich	Kent Barnes
	MCA- Attn, Dee Dee Johnson	District Construction Engineers